

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application. Claim 22 has been amended and new claims 25 and 26 have been added. The Examiner only examined claims 1-22. However, a Preliminary Amendment was filed on July 12, 2004 (copy attached) adding new claims 23 and 24.

In the Office Action it is stated that the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 12, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. Although the Applicant believes that copies of the documents cited in the International Search Report would be made available to the Examiner in the national stage application (see MPEP 1893.03(g) Information Disclosure Statement in a National Stage Application [R-2] – 1800 Patent Cooperation Treaty) Applicant is providing the references because the references were apparently not forwarded by the International Bureau.

Claim 22 is objected to because of the noted informalities. Claim 22 has been amended. Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Claims 12-22 stand objected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Odley et al. (5,836,782) in view of Jenson et al. (5,759,061). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant is confused as to whether this is a §102 rejection or a §103 rejection. On page 2, it is labeled as a §102 rejection and in the bottom paragraph of page 2, Jenson et al. is listed, but no further mention of Jenson et al. is made in the Office Action. Applicant will treat this as a §102 rejection and only discuss Odley et al. below.

Referring to the figures in Odley et al., more particularly Figure 1A, the arrangement does not possess a “cutting edge ... pointing towards the flat contact surface” as recited in claim 12. The Examiner would appear to be suggesting that the corners 2A and 4A of Odley et al. correspond to the cutting edge of the present application. Even if that were to be admitted, the cutting edges of Odley et al. do not point to the opposite flat contact surface. As a result, the cutting edges of Odley et al. do not cut efficiently since the wire must be held in tension if the wire is to be cut in the configuration shown in Figure 1A. Only in this configuration (i.e., when the wire is under tension) will the corners 2A and 4A of the two blades cut. Without the tension, the wire would merely lay parallel in the channel formed between the two blades. In contrast, however, when a wire is

inserted into a contact according to the present invention, it will be held parallel to the surface of one blade, but the other blade pointing towards the flat contact surface will enable the cutting edge to pierce through the insulation of the wire and allow a good connection to be made. The pointing direction of the cutting edge toward the flat contact surface is a very material and essential feature of the invention. The cutting edges in Odley et al. simply miss their targets and are ineffectual.

With brief regard to Jenson et al., it clearly does not disclose a contact having the features of claim 12, nor would it arrive at these features in combination with the disclosure of Odley et al. The argument above also applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to claim 21.

With regard to claims 20 and 22, Odley et al. does not disclose a “flat contact surface ... and a cutting surface.” Assuming that Odley et al. does disclose a flat contact surface and a cutting edge, it is possible that a line drawn parallel to the flat contact surface and passing through the point defined by the end of the cutting edge will be parallel to either side of the cutting edge. However, this will only be the case when the line drawn parallel to the flat contact surface is also parallel to the cutting edge. New claims 25 and 26 have been added to emphasize this difference.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN & BERNER, LLP



Kenneth M. Berner

Registration No. 37,093

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: June 3, 2005